

25X1X8

Approved For Release 2001/07/26 : CIA-RDP75-00001R000100300015-8

Approved For Release 2001/07/26 : CIA-RDP75-00001R000100300015-8

ad. #2

Information
17 May 1966
Page: 2

CPYRGHT

Insinuation without Cover

During the Inquisition's five centuries spiteful people had an easy way to suppress their enemies. An accusation of association with the devil was usually enough. The Inquisition tribunals did the rest.

In our times the methods have become more subtle, but not less effective for that reason. You accuse your enemies of being connected with the CIA, an accusation, which naturally is more difficult to refute than to make, and the anti-Americanism's professionals do the rest.

Two distinguished newspapers, the American New York Times and the Danish Information, have within the past two weeks published accusations against the international writer and artist cooperation, The Congress for Cultural Freedom. But whereas the accusations in The New York Times were anonymous and clearly written by a person of very little knowledge of the congress' activity, then the accuser in Information has a name, Frank Oswald, and a knowledge of several years of the congress, having contributed to several of its publications.

Insinuation without Cover

And whereas The New York Times never has indicated, that there should be any direct and unequivocal connection between the congress and the CIA, then Frank Oswald founds his accusations just on such an insinuation, which he without a cover in the facts ascribes to the American paper.

Frank Oswald writes in Information of 14-15 May: "The paper thus makes a sensational statement to the effect that the CIA gave financial support to the liberal Congress for Cultural Freedom and publications connected with it, such as the British Express."

However, any one knowledgeable in English will of the following unabridged text of the relevant paragraph in The New York Times' article in the paper's inter-

national issue of 28 April see, that Oswald's account by no means covers the origi-

CPYRIGHT

- 2 -

nal. The New York Times wrote namely:

"Through similar channels (foundations), the CIA has supported groups of exiles from Cuba and refugees from Communism in Europe or anti-Communist but liberal organizations of intellectuals such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom and some of their newspapers and magazines.

Encounter magazine, a well-known anti-Communist, intellectual monthly with editions in Spanish and German as well as in English, was for a long time--though it is not now--one of the indirect beneficiaries of CIA funds through arrangements that have never been publicly explained."

Thus a claim about CIA support through philanthropic funds and thus no accusation of a direct and unequivocal connection.

The distinction has far more than academic importance. Cavald's accusation implicates a deliberate and accepted connection between the congress and the American intelligence organ, whereas The New York Times' formulation leaves the possibility open, that the congress unknowingly has been used by the CIA via other organizations

The congress' General Secretary, Composer Nicolas Nabokov, points at this in a letter to The New York Times: "We have with surprise and anxiety read the report in the New York Times of 27 April, in which it is maintained, that an American Government organ has contributed secretly to a lot of various cultural activities all over the world. The report suggests, that there among the many independent patrons of the arts, who in course of time have contributed financially to the Congress for Cultural Freedom's conferences and publications, possibly are American funds, which have had connection with the CIA.

The Congress for Cultural Freedom has never consciously received support, direct or indirect, from any secret source, it be American or any other nationality. Grants and contributions received in course of time have been given in the form of grants in aid, and none of the donors have tried to influence the way the Congress for Cultural Freedom carries out its international program. We have always gone our ways chosen by ourselves, and all our debates and discussions--yes, our entire program--have

CPYRIGHT

- 3 -

been a matter of public record. We have been completely convinced, that private American and European philanthropy was non-governmental.

We will, however, in the light of the implications, which have been raised in The New York Times' report, ask individuals and organizations, which have supported us, to our satisfaction to explain the private character of their support. It is our intention to maintain the congress' unassailable integrity.

An entirely Free Organ

So far the congress' general secretary. In addition four prominent Americans have given the congress a vote of confidence without any reservation at all in a joint address to The New York Times. Two of these were ambassadors under President Kennedy and the third was the president's political adviser, namely the Professors John Kenneth Galbraith, George Kennan, and Arthur Schlesinger jr., and the fourth was an American university professor, atomic Physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, one of the MacCarthyism's best known offers in the United States. It read as follows: "On the basis of our own experiences with the congress during the past 16 years--with its seminars, art festivals, its periodicals, and its staff--we can categorically say, that we are in no doubt about the independence of its policy, its employees' integrity, or the value of its work. To our experience, the congress under the leadership of General Secretary Nicolas Nabokov has been a completely free organ, responding only to its members' and donors' wishes and its committee's deci-

sions. Into the congress' activity, its periodicals and other activities will not be mixed any special persons. We believe, that the congress has had no other obligation toward the cultural freedom--and that it on the contrary has freely has criticized all nations' actions and policy, in-
cluding the United States. This has never been done before, when

CPYRGHT

able because all four of them, as we know, are among the sharpest critics of their country's policy in Southeast Asia.

Also three former and present Encounter editors, the British poet Stephen Spender and the two American writers, Malvin J. Tasky and Irving Kristol, protested to The New York Times. They wrote, for example, "Does The Times want the reader to draw the conclusion, that the editorial content of the former or present editors of the Encounter were under influence by the CIA? We cannot believe that this was The Times' intention. Our political articles (a small part of the whole) have been written by prominent reporters and scientists, whose integrity and whose fame are beyond all doubt (many of them are actually contributors to The New York Times magazine and book review sections). They write what they want, and in the Encounter they have criticized the British Suez-adventure, the Soviet intervention in Hungary, the American part in Sino Bay, and the bombings in Vietnam. Regarding the editors, we are free agents and not parts of somebody's propaganda."

Serious Typographical Error

They also point out that there in The Times only sentence about the Encounter is a palpable wrong information and (in the International issue) a serious typographical error.

It is not true when The Times says that the Encounter had or has some issues in German or Spanish. Furthermore, the version of the article which was published in the New York Times International Edition (of 25 April) contained a jumbling up of two separate sentences, covering two different things, which made the report stand much more clearly than it was.

The New York Times article, in fact, in extension, when we read it, says that the Encounter was not a CIA project and did not intend to influence the periodical's editors, nor of any "indirect" benefactors, or that its content had ever had been propagandistic for the CIA. On the contrary, Encounter is a free, independent, international periodical with independent opinions."

COPYRIGHT

All this was available for Frank Oswald, when he wrote his article in Information. The sentence alone with which he continues what previously has been cited shows this. He writes namely: "After vehement protests from prominent Americans such as J.K. Calbraith and Arthur M. Schlesinger the editors had to offer an apology."

Not only did Frank Oswald thus feel entitled to include already denied misunderstandings in his material of accusations, but he furthermore gives his private opinion and strengthens again on his own account the accusations already modified by the editors of The New York Times by saying: "The New York Times gives no source for its accusation, which might be based on the fact that the congress, which for some time was financed by Ford Foundation, followed a special left-wing and anti-Communist line, which often was close to American interests."

Rough and Uniform Description

It is namely no fact at all that the congress followed "a special left-wing and anti-Communist line". The congress is no political organization and thus has no political line. Any one knows that who knows anything about the congress' activity at all, including the former contributor to the congress' publications, Frank Oswald.

As a rough and uniform description, however, the description fits on the congress' Scandinavian secretary, i.e. my personal political opinion and publicity activity, apart from the fact that it is a question how close my views are to those of the United States. Others have during the course of time indicated something quite different. Jens Skeltoft Jensen, late chief editor of Dagens Nyheder, once wrote a few editorials against my Congo articles (in Information) under the title "The Voice in Moscow's".

Oswald's accusations have rather been aimed at me than at the congress, which is proved by the following where Oswald writes: "Sometimes this was reflected in a lack of consequence. Encounter and its sister publications such as the French Preuves and the German Der Monat took up an intransigent attitude toward Castro, North Vietnam and East Europe."

CPYRGHT

6

The fact alone that two of the periodicals mentioned, namely Encounter and Frontline, bring no editorials or editorial comments, makes it difficult to see how they should have been for or against states or persons, and Frank Osvald probably founds his statement on the fact, that all three periodicals—as well as many others—once printed Theodore Draper's analyses of the political development in Cuba under Castro.

Relations with Castro (and Osvald)

Regarding the congress' relations with Castro, I may possibly be allowed to mention, that its local Cuba committee was forbidden under the Batista regime, after the committee's secretary and several other committee members had had to go into exile because of their support to the resistance movement against the Batista dictatorship. At that time the secretary became Castro's first representative in the United States, and the committee's vice president was Castro's present Foreign Minister Raul Roa. I can add, that the committee again is forbidden in Cuba because of its continued work for cultural freedom—thus forbidden by the Castro regime this time.

Examining through the volumes of the three periodicals, it is totally impossible to find cover for Osvald's statement about an editorial interest in one-party regimes in Africa. On the contrary, several contributors have, often to my personal knowledge, expressed a great scepticism toward the new Africa's one-party systems, like the world famous economist Professor W. Arthur Lewis' strongly critical "African Dictatorship" in Encounter's August issue in 1965.

Osvald's final statement, "After Encounter has become independent, the paper will be more critical toward the United States' Vietnam policy," lacks every foundation. It probably aims at Professor Richard Loventhal's "America's Asian Commitment" in Encounter's October issue in 1965, but forgets apparently, that the periodical according to its usual practice also has printed vigorous counterings of Loventhal's views, and that Loventhal himself is one of Encounter's most prominent staff members right from the foundation of the periodical.

CPYRGHT

- 7 -

acknowledge willingly the hostility against the Castro dictatorship and a hostile attitude toward the new African one-party systems. Personal views are the rule and not the exception in the Congress.

The Carré-Schleimann Relationship

I can only regret, that a purely private dispute between Frank Carré and me the undersigned apparently is to be transferred to the public and political level to the injury of an organization, whose work for cultural freedom hardly has pleased any intelligence organization in the East or in the West.

Intellectual activity seldom harmonizes with political commissaries' thoughts and wishes. In case any one should have forgotten it, I can refer to the espionage novel writer John Le Carré's confession: "I tried to remove espionage from the cold war's sterile arguments and to concentrate the eyes of the readers on the expenses the West incurs morally by fighting with the weapons made legitimate by Communism." Where you could read it? In the May issue of Encounter.

Two persons are responsible for the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Scandinavia, former minister Frode Jakobsen as a member of the Congress' international council and I the undersigned as a Scandinavian secretary. I don't hope, that any one will succeed in insinuating a connection between the congress and the CIA, less for the sake of Frode Jakobsen and myself than for the sake of the intellectual climate in Denmark. Otherwise the moral expenses in the cold war certainly have been too great.

Joergen Schleimann.

Carré about the Insinuations

I am sorry, that Joergen Schleimann takes my report of The New York Times' hints at the Congress for Cultural Freedom, Encounter, etc. personally; but he must be the best judge, however, to what extent the characteristic is relevant in this respect.

Regarding the non-personal side of the matter, I loyally reported NYT's statements

and pointed out, lacking documentation, that the paper (what I also mentioned)

COPYRIGHT

offered an apology, can hardly be sufficient reason for suppressing the matter.

However, Schleimann's shocked reaction on my remarks about the congress' "special" line seems to be a little naive. The Congress for Cultural Freedom was founded during the cold war with Arthur Hoesli as spiritual mentor, whose fight against the pro-Soviet and pro-Communist tradition among European left-wing intellectuals--as represented by Andre, for example--was an essential part of the congress' ideology (which, of course, cannot see there is anything painful about). The effort for a "reclaiming" of the Stalinist Communism on an intellectual level was part of the congress' inspiration, at any rate.

In practice this has been reflected in a certain one-sidedness in the choice and treatment of the material, sometimes considering the United States' realpolitical interests. The contrast between the very serious treatment of Africa and the less serious treatment of Cuba, as well as Encounter's late discovery of the Vietnam problem, are just among the more striking new examples.

Outside Denmark these "insinuations" would not attract any attention, nor give rise to any shock. For years the congress was fighting with papers such as New Statesman, which accused the Encounter of functioning as the American foreign policy's prolonged arm, via Ford Foundation's money. (The congress repaid by bringing Statesman's unflattering relations with the Stalinians to light).

All this naturally does not make the congress' publicity and other work less valuable. Though on a much more modest level than the angry Schleimann, I have personally contributed to this work as a staff member in several English publications for several years.